



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,195	03/14/2001	Philip D. Mooney	MOONEY 64	1728

7590

01/16/2004

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

7th Floor

2000 M Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20036-3307

EXAMINER

BEHULU, ALEMAYEHU

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2682

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/805,195

Applicant(s)

MOONEY, PHILIP

Examiner

Alemayehu Behulu

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in line 5 close bracket is missing after "e.g. another cell phone". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 6, line 9, close bracket is missing after "e.g. another cell phone".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706).

Regarding to claim 1, Tillgren discloses a cellular telephone (figure 1, number 104) comprising: a cellular telephone module (figures 1, number 128), a piconet front end (figures 1, number 134), a cordless telephone PSTN gateway role (figure 1, number 130), in communication with cellular telephone module and with piconet front end that the cordless telephone PSTN gateway role

allows a remote piconet device (figure 1, number 102) to answer an incoming call to cellular telephone over a piconet network (figure 6 and column 11, lines 57-67).

Regarding to claim 2, Tillgren discloses the cellular telephone according to claim 1, comprising a cordless telephone role (column 3, lines 63-column 4, lines 25).

Regarding to claim 3, Tillgren discloses the cellular telephone according to claim 1 that piconet front end is a Bluetooth device (column 4, lines 27-33).

Regarding to claim 4, Tillgren discloses the cellular telephone according to claim 1 that cordless telephone PSTN gateway role confirms with Bluetooth device standards (column 4, lines 27-column 5, lines 11 and claim 5).

Regarding to claims 8 and 13, Tillgren discloses remotely answering an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a wireless piconet network, comprising: establishing a piconet network (figure 6, numbers 602 and 604) including cellular telephone (figure 1, number 104) and remote device (figure 1, number 102), routing audio from cellular telephone to remote piconet device over wireless piconet network (column 3, lines 21-39, column 11, lines 57-67 and column 12, lines 8-21).

Regarding to claims 9 and 14, Tillgren discloses remotely answering an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a wireless piconet network according to claims 8 and 13 respectively that performing call establishment functions from cellular telephone under control of remote piconet device (column 5, lines 9-23).

Regarding claims 10 and 15, Tillgren discloses remotely answering an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a wireless piconet network according to claims 8 and 13 respectively that audio is Bluetooth audio (column 4, lines 27-33 and figure 1, numbers 108, 110, 122 and 124).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tillgren (U.S.

Patent No. 6, 339, 706) further in view of Slettengren (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0028674).

Regarding to claim 5, Tillgren discloses the cellular telephone according to claim 1 that remote piconet device (figure 1, number 102). However, Tillgren fails to disclose a remote piconet device is another cellular telephone. But, Slettengren discloses a remote piconet device with another cellular telephone (figure 8, numbers 804 and 806). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) with Slettengren (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0028674) in order to answer a call at different locations.

5. Claims 6, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) further in view of Lunsford (U.S. Patent No. 6, 614, 350).

Regarding to claim 6, Tillgren discloses the cellular telephone according to claim 1, comprising at least one remote piconet device to answer the incoming calls to cellular telephone (figure 1, numbers 102 and figure 6). However, Tillgren fails to disclose an authorized terminal list including unique identification. But, Lunsford discloses an authorized terminal list including

Art Unit: 2682

unique identification (column 3, lines 17-30, column 6, lines 20- lines 55 and column 8, lines 60-67 figures 6-10). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) with Lunsford (U.S. Patent No. 6, 614, 350) in order to secure the system and protect the devices (as suggested by Lunsford).

Regarding to claims 12 and 17, Tillgren discloses remotely answering an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a wireless piconet network according to claims 8 and 13 respectively that establishing cellular telephone to remotely answer incoming calls to cellular telephone (figure 6). However, Tillgren fails to disclose a list of authorized permitted remote piconet devices. But, Lunsford discloses a list of authorized permitted remote piconet device (column 3, lines 17-30, column 6, lines 20-lines 55). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) with Lunsford (U.S. Patent No. 6, 614, 350) in order to secure the system and protect the devices (as suggested by Lunsford).

6. Claims 7, 11, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) further in view of Larsson (U.S. Patent No. 6, 535, 498).

Regarding to claims 7, 11, and 16 Tillgren discloses the cellular telephone according to claim 1 and piconet a network (figure 1). However, Tillgren fails to disclose piconet network, which includes scatternet connection. But Larsson discloses piconet network, which includes scatternet connection (figure 3 and column 4, lines 30-30 and claims 10 and 24). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine

Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) with Larsson (U.S. Patent No. 6, 535, 498) in order to have communication with different piconet devices.

7. Claims 18, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) further in view of Hendriskson (U.S. Patent No. 5, 697, 062).

Regarding to claims 18 and 23, Tillgren discloses allowing a remote piconet device answer an incoming call to a wireless telephone in communication with piconet device (figure 6) that passing incoming call information (column 11, lines 57-67) from wireless telephone receiving an incoming call (figure 1, number 104) to remote piconet device (figure 1, number 102) over a wireless piconet (figure 1, number 136) to and remote piconet (figure 1, number 102 and column 11, lines 57-67). However, Tillgren fails to disclose audibly ringing remote piconet device in response to receipt of incoming call information by wireless telephone. But, Hendriskson discloses audibly ringing of a receiver in response to receipt of incoming call information (figures 1B). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) with Hendriskson (U.S. Patent No. 5, 697, 062) in order to distinguish the caller and type of the call.

Regarding to claim 21, the combination of Tillgren and Hendriskson disclose method of allowing a remote piconet device answer an incoming call to a wireless telephone in communication with piconet device according to claim 18 that wireless piconet is a Bluetooth piconet network (see Tillgren figure 1 and column 4, lines 26-34).

Regarding to claim 22, the combination of Tillgren and Hendriskson disclose method of allowing a remote piconet device answer an incoming call to a wireless telephone in communication with

piconet device according to claim 18 that incoming call information includes a ring indication (see Hendriskson, figure 1B, number 34).

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) and Hendriskson (U.S. Patent No. 5, 697, 062) further in view of Raffel (U.S. Patent No. 5, 675, 629).

Regarding to claim 19, the combination of Tillgren and Hendriskson discloses a method of allowing a remote piconet device answer an incoming call to a wireless telephone in communication with piconet device according to claim 18 and wireless telephone and remote piconet device and (see Tillgren figure 1, numbers 104 and 102) that audibly ringing of receiver device in response to receipt of incoming call information by wireless telephone (see Hendriskson, figure 1B). However, Tillgren and Hendriskson fail to disclose audibly ringing of both wireless telephone and remote device together in response to receipt of incoming call information by wireless telephone. But, Raffel discloses ringing of all the extensions associated to the main line in response to the incoming call (figure 2 and column 37, lines 20-29).

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) and Hendriskson (U.S. Patent No. 5, 697, 062) with Raffel (U.S. Patent No. 5, 675, 629) in order to answer the call at different locations.

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) and Hendriskson (U.S. Patent No. 5, 697, 062) further in view of Slettengren (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0028674).

Art Unit: 2682

Regarding to claim 20, the combination of Tillgren and Hendriskson disclose method of allowing a remote piconet device answer an incoming call to a wireless telephone in communication with piconet device according to claim 18 that audibly ringing (see Hendriskson, figure 1B) in response to receipt of incoming call information by wireless telephone. However, Tillgren and Hendriskson fail to disclose having at least two remote piconet devices. But, Slettengren discloses having at least two remote piconet devices (figure 8, number 806). Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tillgren (U.S. Patent No. 6, 339, 706) and Hendriskson (U.S. Patent No. 5, 697, 062) with Slettengren (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0028674) in order to answer a call at different locations.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hahn et al. U.S. Patent No. 6, 078, 825 Modular Wireless Handset System For Hands Free Talking.

Raussi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6, 208, 876 Wireless Communication Device.

Johansson U.S. Patent No. 5, 913, 163 Integrated Local Communication System


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alemayehu Behulu whose telephone number is 703-305-4828.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 703-308-6739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-3501.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

AB


1-9-04

NGUYEN T. VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER